

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/782,090

Applicant(s)

ROTHSCHILD, WAYNE H.

Examiner

Arthur O. Hall

Art Unit

3714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Arthur O. Hall.

(3) Jeremie Moll.

(2) Sorinel Cimpoes.

(4) John Hotaling.

Date of Interview: 18 October 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 41.

Identification of prior art discussed: Hedrick et al. (US6,135,884) and Wurz et al. (US6,334,612).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

JOHN M. HOTALING, II
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Arthur O. Hall
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant proposed amendments that recite substantially that variable inputs on a secondary display are provided based on the current or play state of the game, wherein a denomination menu is provided prior to start of the game so that the player can choose a wager. Applicants believe that these amendments define over Hedrick and Wurz. It appears to the Examiner that neither Hedrick and Wurz disclose the previously stated amendments in combination. However, Examiner must further consider these amendments and any other amendments upon response to the Non-final Office Action dated 8/2/2007 .



JOHN M. HOTALING, II
PRIMARY EXAMINER